

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/583,413

Applicant(s)

YOSHIDA, NAOHIRO

Examiner

Tony Chuo

Art Unit

1795

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tony Chuo.

(3) _____

(2) Patrick Muffo.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 23 September 2009.Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 17.Identification of prior art discussed: Yoshida et al (WO 2004/049488).Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The claims were discussed in light of the cited references. The proposed amendment adds functional limitations to the apparatus claims that do not appear to distinguish over the structure disclosed in the cited references.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Tony Chuo/
Examiner, Art Unit 1795